DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 137 439 UD 016 795

AUTHOR Brandt, David E.
TITLE Reading Skills Laboratories- Optional Assignment, School Year 1974-1975.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 18p.; New York City Board of Education Function No. 09-59679

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Alternative Schools; Economically Disadvantaged; *Educationally Disadvantaged; *High School Students; Individual Instruction; Individualized Instruction; *Reading Improvement; *Reading Materials; *Reading Skills; *Remedial Reading Programs; Secondary Education
IDENTIFIERS California Achievement Test; *New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

This document describes and evaluates the Reading Skills Laboratories Optional Assignment Program for the school year 1974-75. The purpose of this program was to improve the reading skills of high school students (grades 9-12) whose reading fell two or more years below their grade level. The program was conducted in 8 alternative independent mini high schools in the New York City school system. Among the program objectives were the following: to improve reading levels, to generate more positive attitudes toward reading, and to provide students with reading skills that would improve performance in other academic areas. The program combined an individualized approach to reading together with high interest level reading material. One of the major strengths of the program was the teaching staff and their ability to establish an excellent working relationship with their students. One of the major weaknesses of the program was poor student attendance at some schools. Student reading levels were improved and more positive attitudes toward reading were generated for many of the students who did attend school. (Author/AM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED137439

EVALUATION REPORT

Function # 09-59679

Reading Skills Laboratories-Optional Assignment

School Year 1974-1975

David E. Brandt, Ph.D.

An evaluation of a New York City School district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10) performed for the Board of Education of the city of New York for the 1974-75 school year.

UD016795

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Dr. Anthony J. Polemeni, Director

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

Function # 09-59679 CHAPTER I

THE PROGRAM

The purpose of this program was to improve the reading skills of high school students (grades 9-12) whose reading fell two or more years below their grade level. The program was carried out in 8 alternative independent mini high schools in the N.Y.C. school-system.

The specific program objectives were as follows:

1. To improve the reading level of economically and educationally disadvantaged students.

2. To generate more positive attitudes toward reading for pleasure and information.

3. To provide students with reading skills that will help their performance in other areas.

Economically disadvantaged students were selected for the program on the basis of standardized test scores (MAT or CAT) and on the basis of recommendations of guidance counselors and teachers who felt that the students inability to read was seriously hampering their progress. (It should be noted that in some schools a student's participation in the reading program was voluntary.)

Each student was programmed for five periods of remedial reading class per week in addition to regularly scheduled tax levy English classes.

The classes were designed to emphasize an individulalized approach based on continuous diagnosis of the students' strengths and weaknesses. Students were assigned a choice of high interest multilevel material which they worked on individually.

In addition to time devoted for improvement of individual skills, time was allowed for free reading of paperbacks, magazines, newspapers etc., and for group reading of plays, and discussions of stories.

An after school program was also included (30 hours in the fall and 30 hours in the spring) to involve students in various activities such as seeing plays, writing a newspaper, class discussion, etc.

In addition, an attempt was made to intergrate the reading classes with work done in other classes in the students' schedule.

Staff- The program employed 8 full time teachers, one full time and one ½ time teacher trainer[1]. Teachers sympathetic to the needs of the students and their ability to be flexible in their teaching approach were selected. Teacher trainers visited teachers throughout the program to provide on site training. In addition, ten 3 hour training sessions were conducted as workshops on specific techniques needed by the teachers.

The entire program was under the direction of the program coordinator whose responsibility it was to dissiminate information and deal with various problems as they arose.

1 Please note that the teacher trainers are borrowed from the Mini School Program, Function # 09-59617.

CHAPTER II

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Purpose The objectives of the evaluation were the following:

1. To determine whether as a result of participation in the corrective reading program the reading grade of the students will show a statistically significant difference be tween the real post test and the anticipated post test score.

2. To determine the extent to which the program as actually carried out coincided with the program as described in the project proposal.

Method

1 a) All students in the program were tested by means of the California Achievement Test (CAT) at the beginning of the academic year. (In two schools an insufficient number of CATs were available and the MAT was used.) Students were then retested with alternate forms of the same test at the end of the school year.

b) Data was analyzed by comparing the students' anticipated post test score, without treatment, (determined by means of historical regression) with his actual post test score . A correlated t test was used to compare the two scores.

2. In order to determine the extent to which there was agreement between the program as carried out and as it was described in the project proposal, the following was done:

On-site visits were made to each school, classes were observed, interviews were held with teachers, students, and program administrators. Further, an informal questionnaire was devised and administered to all teachers in the program in order to gain additional information and feedback.

CHAPTER III

FINDINGS

A.The first objective was to determine whether as a result of participation in the corrective reading program the reading scores of the students will show a statistically significant difference between the real post test score and the anticipated post test score.

Results The results of the statistical analysis presented in the MIR 30A (appended) indicate that this objective was met.

B. The second evaluation objective was to determine the extent to which the program as actually carried out coincided with the program as described in the project proposal.

Results: There were no major discrepancies noted between the program observed and as described in the project proposal.

C. Additional findings

1. One of the major strengths of the program lies in the motivation of the teaching staff and their ability to establish an excellent working relationship with their students.

2. There is considerable variability among the different schools within the program, reflecting the student population, the school in which the program was set, and the values and skills of the teachers. Therefore the findings listed below may not be applicable to all schools .

3. Attendance is a problem in some schools. It should be noted that many students were chronic truants prior to this.

4. Diagnosis of students reading difficulties was not always adequate and reflected the initial inexperience of some teachers. Teacher trainers were involved in correcting this problem.

5. Many of the teachers hired for the program were initially

poorly prepared to teach reading to students with severe reading handicaps.

6. The space alloted for the reading classes in many schools is poor because they are not adequately isolated from other classes and distractions.

7. The materials for the classes seemed adequate, however, the teaching staff felt that they should have greater input in choosing materials for their specific school populations.

8. Teachers are placed in the unfortunate position of having to respond to the guidelines of the program and the sometimes conflicting directives of the school in which the program is set.

9. It is difficult for one teacher working alone (without a teacher aid) to effectively implement an individual teaching approach.

D. Response to recommendations from prior study.

1. That the program be recycled. The program was recycled.

2. That special security arrangements be made to obviate transportation of valuable material. This was done when possible.

3. Guidance and social service personnel should be available to students. This was done where possible with tax levy funds, however, services are still not adequate.

4. Ancillary personnel in the form of aides or student tutors should be provided. Aides were available in some schools but are needed in all schools.

E. The program is serving the population which it was designed to serve.

CHAPTER IV

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of data collected the program has met it primary objectives.

The following recommendations are being made based on the findings presented above.

1. Further steps should be taken to improve attendance in those schools where attendance is poor.

2. Diagnostic procedures should be improved in those schools where diagnostic procedures are presently inadequate.

3. The program administrator should have greater input in the hiring of reading teachers in the program to assure the presence of adequately trained teaching staff.

4. Because of the great diversity in student population and school settings there should be somewhat greater flexibility in allowing the program to fit the needs of individual settings both in terms of classroom programing and selection of materials. This might best be accomplished by allowing greater teacher input.

5. Improved classroom facilities should be made available in those schools where class areas are open to extensive distractions.

6. Communication among the teachers should be improved so that successes and failures with various materials and techniques could be shared.

7. Some form of classroom assistance should be provided to the teachers in the form of aides, student tutors, etc.

8. Some way must be found to reconcile differences between program guidelines and the needs of the individual schools.
9. The program should be recycled next year since it has met its major objectives.

CHAPTER V

PROGRAM ABSTRACT

Component Code	Activity Code	Objective Code
60816	720	801

The purpose of this program was to improve the reading skills of economically and educationally disadvantaged high school students whose reading fell two or more years behind grade level. The program was carried out in 8 alternative independent mini high schools in the N.Y.C. school system.

The specific program objectives were as follows:

1. To improve the reading levels of students described above.
2. To generate more positive attitudes toward reading.
3. To provide students with reading skills that would improve their performance in other academic areas.

The program utilized an individualized approach to reading combined with high interest level reading material.

The results of the evaluation study indicated that this approach combined with excellent student-teacher rapport accounted for the program reaching objectives #1 and #2 above. Objective #1 was evaluated on the basis of standardized test scores; #2 on the basis of interviews with the students and teachers involved in the program.

Function # 09-59679

Use Table 30A. for Historical Regression Design (6-Step Formula) for Reading (English); Math (English); Reading (Non-English); Math (Non-English).

30A. Standardized Test Results.

In the Table below, enter the requested information about the tests used to evaluate the effectiveness of major project components/activities in achieving desired objectives. This form requires means obtained from scores in the form of grade equivalent units as processed by the 6 step formula (see District Evaluator's Handbook of Selected Evaluation Procedures, p. 45-49). Before completing this table, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

[49]

Component Code	Activity Code	Test Used[1]	Form		Level		Total N[2]	Group I.D.[3]	Number Tested[4]	Pretest		Predicted Posttest Mean	Actual Posttest		Statistical Data	
			Pre	Post	Pre	Post				Date	Mean		Date	Mean	Obtained Value of t	Level[5] of significance
60815	720	CAT	A	B	Int	Int	40	15	22	9/74	5.0	6.0	5/75	6.5	1.89	.05
60816	720	CAT	A	B	Int	Int	320	16	206	9/74	5.3	5.7	5/75	6.3	8.36	.001
60816	720	MAT	F	G	Int	Int	120	16	45	9/74	4.8	5.4	5/75	5.8	13.70	.001

1/ Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-58, CAT-70, etc.).
2/ Total number of participants in the activity.
3/ Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 5). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.
4/ Total number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations.
5/ Specify level of statistical significance obtained (e.g., $p \leq .05$; $p \leq .01$).

-4-

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION - DATA LOSS FORM

(attach to MIR, item #30) Function # 09-59679

In this table enter all Data Loss information. Between MIR, item #30 and this form, all participants in each activity must be accounted for. The component and activity codes used in completion of item #30 should be used here so that the two tables match. See definitions below table for further instructions.

Component Code	Activity Code	(1) Group I.D.	(2) Test Used	(3) Total N	(4) Number Tested/ Analyzed	(5) Participants Not Tested/ Analyzed		(6) Reasons why students were not tested, or if tested, were not analyzed	
						N	%		Number/ Reason
6 0 8 1 6	7 2 0	16	CAT	480	273	207	43%	Students in program too short time	53
								Absent for test or dropped out	154

(1) Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 5, grade 9). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.
(2) Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-70, SDAT-74, etc.).
(3) Number of participants in the activity.
(4) Number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations found on item #30.
(5) Number and percent of participants not tested and/or not analyzed on item #30.
(6) Specify all reasons why students were not tested and/or analyzed. For each reason specified, provide a separate number count. If any further documentation is available, please attach to this form. If further space is needed to specify and explain data loss, attach additional pages to this form.

Function # 09-59579

Measures of growth other than Standardized Tests

30D. This question is designed to describe the attainment of approved objectives not normally associated with measurement by norm referenced standardized achievement tests. Such objectives usually deal with behavior that is indirectly observed, especially in the affective domain. For example, a reduction in truancy, a positive change in attitude toward learning, a reduction in disruptive behavior, an improved attitude toward self (as indicated by repeated interviews), etc., are frequently held to be prerequisite to the shift toward increased academic achievement by disadvantaged learners. Where your approved measurement devices do not lend themselves to reporting on tables 30A, B or C, use any combination of items and report on separate pages. Attach additional pages if necessary.

Component Code	Activity Code	Objective Code	
60816	720	801	52

Brief Description Individualized instruction in reading ~~for economically and educationally~~ disadvantaged high school students

Number of cases observed: 100 Number of cases in treatment: 480

Pretreatment index of behavior (Specify scale used):

Although no formal or objective methods were used to measure change in attitude toward school or motivation to learn, interviews held with students reflected a high level of motivation and improved attitudes toward reading.

Criterion of success: none

Was objective fully met? Yes [x] No [ ] If yes, by what criteria do you know? To the extent that the original proposal was implemented and on the basis of objective test results.

Comments:

EVALUATION OF TITLE I READING PROGRAM
OPTIONAL ASSIGNMENT PROGRAM

1. School _____
2. Teacher _____
3. Total population of school _____
4. Total number of students in Title I reading program _____
5. Average class size _____
6. a) Are there any students eligible for Title I reading who are not in your class? _____
   b) If so, how many _____ and why ? _____

7. What is your average class attendace (by percent e.g. 65%, 80%) for all classes? _____
8. What steps are taken, if any, to improve class attendance ?

9. On the **average** how would you rate the motivation of the students in your class (circle one) good fair poor
10. What steps are taken ,if any, to improve the motivation of students in your class ?
11. How would you rate the materials available for use in your class ? good fair poor
12. How would you rate the physical space available for your class? good fair poor

13. What do you see as the major constraints in reaching your classroom goals or objectives (e.g. insufficient materials, poor attendance, lack of cooperation from other teaching staff, etc.)

14. At the present time what do you see as the major shortcomings of your own classroom program ?

15. What are its major strengths ?

16. What steps mignt be taken to improve your classes ?

17. What steps should be taken improve the program as a whole ?

18. Additional comments (use other side of pages if necessary)